Literary language of the Golden Horde: norms and variations

Fanuza Shakurovna Nurieva

Kazan Federal University, Kremlevskaya Street, 18, Kazan, 420008, Russia

Abstract. The results of the research of the initial stages of Tatar literary language establishing are introduced in this work. Studying the establishment of Tatar literary language, which is considered to be the recension of the Volga region Turkic literary language, includes a wide range of the literary monuments. The detailed examination shows that the Golden Horde literary language was formed basing on centuries-old all-Turkic literary traditions, and it was absorbing regional linguistic features of the Kipchak type. The article applies a new for Tatar linguistics method of mass lexical-morphological analysis of all the appealed materials with its further statistic processing. The obtained results are interpreted through the division of facts into 'essential' and 'referential'.

Introduction

This article provides general characteristics of the Golden Horde literary monuments' language. The monuments of literature were created during the XIII – early XV centuries in the cultural centres of the Golden Horde: Sarai, Khoresm, and Mamluk Egypt. These works are of religious-didactic content: 'Kyissas al-anbia' (1310) by Rabguzi (=KR), 'Nahj al-Faradis' (1358) by Mahmud al-Bulgari (=NF), 'Jumjuma sultan' (1369) by Khisam Katib (=J.), 'Kisekbash kitaby' (=Kb); as well as of laic content: 'Khosrov and Shirin' (1383) by Kutb (=KhSh), 'Mukhabbat-name' (1353) by Khoresmi (=MN), 'Gulistan bit-turki' (1391) by Seiif Sarai (=Gb); Arabic-Kipchak glossaries, e.g. 'Codex Cumanicus' (1303) (=CC); texts on Muslim law: 'Irshad al-muluk va as-salatin' (1383) (=IM).

The initial theoretical viewpoint of our research is based upon reasoned understanding of the Turkic literary monuments that is reflected in the works by E.R. Tenishev [1] and such forerunners as A.N. Samoylovich [2], A. Zajaczkowski [3], E.N. Najip [4] etc.

Materials and methods

A thesis that all the Turkic languages shared one literary language (which though experienced changes under the influence of living dialects) compiled the division of the Turkic written culture within the Islamic civilization into periods proposed by A.N. Samoylovich [2]. The division into periods is as follows: the first period – with the centre in Kashgar and the forming point of the Kara-Khanid Khanate; the second – with the centres in the basin of the Syr Darya's lower course and in Khoresm and the consolidation of Islam among Oghuz and Kipchak Turks; the third – with a number of centres in the domiciled part of the Chagatai Khanate and the reinforcement of cultural life in the Timurid lands.

A.N. Samoylovich placed special importance on the second period, the Kipchak-Oghuz period, as it was the very period (not the Chagatai one) when the situation appeared to be auspicious to form a common literary language for all the Muslim Turkic tribes of the Mongol Empire. Due to establishment of Genghis Khan Empire, it was the period when all the main modern Muslim Turkic literary languages sprang. The scholar says that contemporary Tatar language has direct continuity from the Golden Horde literary language: "Kazan-Tatar literary language, which has experienced several development stages, shares its oldest roots, Kipchak roots with the works of literature of the Golden Horde time in which Kipchak elements prevail, that is earlier than the XV century as it used to be claimed. The Crimean Tatar literary language has the same origin" [2: 21].

Samoylovich's conception [2] of the unified literary tradition continuity is maintained by E.R. Tenishev's works [1]. Recognizing the division of the Turkic literary languages development into three periods by Samoylovich, E.R. Tenishev suggests stratifying the Turkic literary languages development not only chronologically but also spatially. Thus the literary monuments would be classified into time-dependent periods (starting from the first written monument of literature as Runic Koine of the VII-IX centuries) as well as into regional variants. In addition to the linguistic facts, E.R. Tenishev's theoretical statements rely on the modern theories of the literary language development, the typology, and such substantial components as sociolinguistic and complex approach to the problem.

E.N. Najip made a significant contribution to the studies of certain monuments relating to the period of our interest [4]. Contrastive examination of the monuments (which includes, first of all, identifying lexical peculiarities, extraction of the lexical items

according to their dialectal feature and further statistical processing) created on the territory of the Golden Horde and Egypt, led E.N. Najip to the following conclusions: 1) by the XIV century common (for the Golden Horde and Egypt) Kipchak-Oghuz literary language of j-group formed; 2) simultaneously with this brand-new literary language, the more archaic written language of the z-group kept to be in use (E.N. Najip names it Oghuz-Kipchak literary language of the downstream Volga – Khoresm [4]. In this works there is a defined line of the development and continuity of languages and literary traditions.

The general line of the Turkic-Tatar language development since the XIII century can be presented as follows: the written literary form of the initial period language in its development in the literary centres of the Golden Horde orientates itself to the graphical and grammatical norms of Kara-Khanid and Uighur areas literary languages. The reason is that these areas during the mentioned period of time were the Muslim knowledge centres, which spread the basic principles of the religion as well as the corresponding forms of the written literary language (in which mostly the religious-didactic literature was embodied). The cultural life of the Golden Horde since the time of the independent government establishing was accompanied by a strong cultural influence of the famous Muslim ascetic religious scholars. That is why it is not surprising that in the Golden Horde regional literary centres the written literary language based on the Kara-Khanid-Uighur variant of the Turkic written language held a significant position, and it strengthened its presence in the literary centres of the Golden Horde. At the same time the main population of the Jochid Ulus (both settled and nomad) were the native speakers of Kipchak tribal language, as it proved by the historians' and culture experts' works. Although among the inhabitants of the Golden Horde there were also the natives of Oghuz and Karluk type of languages (on a large scale probably among the warriors and in the cities, e.g. Uighurs in a chancellery). Thus, the mentioned natives of the Muslim civilization due to the ethnical-demographic conditions found themselves among the prevailing number of Kipchak language native speakers. This ethnic situation created a supra-dialectal Koine of the Kipchak nature in the cultural and trading centres. The very fact finds its approval in our research material based on the earlier mentioned texts. It gives evidence that a folk-spoken Koine influences the norm of a written literary language forming under the certain conditions during the time period under study. This influence and interaction of the old traditions and the new linguistic processes found various forms of reflection in the different literary monuments'

language. It depended on a number of factors: genre of a monument (religious-didactic literature stayed more stable, though laic literature accepted the novation easier), education level and belonging to a certain literary and art school of the author, requester of the work (e.g. 'Khosrov and Shirin' by Kutb, 'Mukhabbat-name' by Khoresmi), defined conditions of the creation place, and the copyist.

The language of the Golden Horde literary monuments in the study of Turkic languages is defined as 'mixed'. However, there is no unified meaning of the term 'mixed' among the scholars of the Turkic studies. By a 'mixed' they mean presence in the monument's text any different classification group language (e.g. Kipchak, Oghuz, Uighur, Karluk) elements: Phonetic, Grammatical, Lexical. Very often they gain geographic or areal terms instead of the mentioned linguistic ones: 'Chorasmian written language', 'Khoresm-Golden Horde written language', 'eastern Turkic language', 'Golden Horde-Egypt literary language'; or even chronological nomination occurs: old Turkic, Medio-Turkic; sometimes social-political terms are used: 'Mamluk-Kipchak', 'Chagatai language'. As a rule, according to these terms the certain circle of the monuments is not defined. Meanwhile, the contemporary linguistics has a precise meaning of the 'mixed'. Particularly, it is used when talking about the Creole, which formed under specific social-cultural conditions [5]. In such occasions it is usually spoken about substantial moves in the lexical and grammatical systems of the contacting languages or dialects. Besides, the 'mixed' in the Turkic studies traditions doesn't mean changes in the language systems; it means a usage of a literary monument's linguistic norm in the other as a dialectic entity. Into this category fall both synchronic and archaic (relevant to a language of earlier times) units. Such a terminological uncertainty significantly hardens the possibility of contrastive studying of the literary monuments language. As far as there is not any unified system of 'mixed language' characteristics, there is a strong need in elaboration the precise common criteria for definition the monument's language. Taking in account the uncertainty of the term 'mixed language' of a monument in the Turkic languages studies we prefer to talk not about their mixed nature, but about the correspondence between the normalizations and variations registered in the language of this monument.

Also we widely use such ideas as 'essential' and 'referential' introduced by Blagova [6], which correlate with concepts of norm and variation as well. This approach, having been demonstrated on the example of the Turkic case-system, turns out to be quite successful to analyse other grammatical

categories of the Turkic languages. That is why we apply the stratification of the text to single out its essential and referential elements, not only case inflection, but also verbal categories, first of all aspectual and tense verbal forms. Moreover, we use the same terms for the Phonetic and Graphical features of each monument.

Main Body

As it is evident through the Phonetic-Graphical and Morphological characteristics marked out in our study, every single written monument is the certain and lively reflection of the linguistic situations. It is possible to acknowledge that in the early monuments of the Golden Horde the Karakhanid-Uighur traditions are stable, though in the Volga region a new variant of regional literary language starts to form simultaneously. The Karakhanid-Uighur linguistic tradition tends to have the following Graphical-Phonetic peculiarities:

- keeping on the usage of the anlaut alif and omitting the blocked vowel, as in the Old Turkic. Conf.: اذكو *äδgü* 'good, righteous', ار *är* 'a man' and اتر *ir* 'a warrior';
- keeping on the usage of the labial harmony;
- usage of the -δ-: *quδuγ* 'a well';
- writing breath -q- in the intervocalic position (*saqyndy* 'he thought');
- keeping on the usage of the stable traditional combinations, such as -*aγy, -yγy, -uγu* (*buγun* 'a joint') as well as the auslaut -*γ* (*saryγ* 'yellow').

At the same time, the sequence of these peculiarities accomplishment in the certain texts goes from its maximum right down.

Among the Phonetic-Graphical features the following ones are stable: the labial harmony, intervocalic -*q*- and the -*aγu*- combination. The most dynamic, less stable Phonetic feature is [*ä*], that subsequently gives in to a narrow, non-labial front vowel [*i*], it is defined graphically: ا - > اذ, also changing -*δ*- into -*j*-, because the monuments language reflects the time when j-grapheme penetrates the texts language: *äjär* 'a saddle', *ujmaq* 'to sleep', *qajγu* 'grief'.

Thus, the maximum usage of the Karakhanid-Uighur peculiarities is detected in Kyissas al-anbia' by Rabguzi, the minimum in 'Codex Cumanicus' and 'Irshad al-muluk'.

Switching from Phonetic to Morphological characteristics, we can see that the latter display the same common factors of the Golden Horde language formation. It is significant that the Morphologic specifications correspond to their Phonetic-Graphical occurrences.

Table 1. Classification of the phonetic features of the monuments

		KR	NF	Kb	J.	KhSh	MN	Gb	CC	IM
Kara-Khanid-Uighur	*alif*	○	○							
	labial	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		
	-*δ*-	○	○	○	○					
	-*q*-				○	○	○	○		
	-*aγu*-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		
	-*γ*	○	○	○	○	○				
Variative	*ä ~ i*		☒	☒						
	u ~ y		☒	☒					☒	☒
	δ ~ j		☒			☒				☒
	q ~ γ		☒			☒		☒		
	aγu > au					☒			☒	☒
	γ – omission					☒				
Kipchak Koine	*i*			○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	delabial			○		○	○	○	○	○
	j			○				○	○	○
	w								○	○
	au								○	○
	-*γ omission*							○		○
Uighur features							○	●		

○ - basic usage
☒ - variative usage
● - peripheral usage

The studying of the Morphological categories leads to the following conclusions. Systematic studying of the declension in the monuments language and correlation of all the data received from the analysis of each monument, as well as consideration of all the coincidence and divergence allows asserting that it was in the XIV century when the transition from the Uighur-Kipchak type of declension to the Kipchak type started. Uighur-Kipchak type of declension is in 'Kyissas al-anbia' by Rabguzi, 'Nahj al-Faradis' by Mahmud al-Bulgari, and 'Khosrov and Shirin' by Kutb. The Kipchak type dominates in 'Gulistan bit-turki' by Sarai, Mukhabbat-name' by Khoresmi, 'Jumjuma sultan' by Katib, 'Kisekbash kitaby', 'Codex Cumanicus', and 'Irshad al-muluk'. Collection of forms left behind the basic system of declension mostly correlate with each other. For example, in the noun paradigm: -*a* dative case (KhSh, Gb, MN, J.), -*i* accusative (MN, Kb), -*dan* elative (KhSh, MN). Consideration of their position in the inflection system of each monument allows classifying them as Oghuz type of inflection and reckon as the allo-dialectal related to the basic system of inflection.

Analysis of synthetic aspect and tense verbal forms also approved active interaction between written literary traditions and the regional Koine. This interaction occurred to be dissimilar and changing in the language of certain literary monuments of the Golden Horde.

Among the forms of the Past tense in the language of the XIII – early XV centuries' monuments the most widespread and polysemant was -*dy* form. Perfect tense forms (-*myš, -γan, -yp tur*) usage is quite limited and these forms reflect the alive process of the changes in the Perfect system: new -*γan* form inclusion; -*myš* as a poetical-expressive means of the prestigious literary traditions; -*yp tur* – spoken dialectal form, actively penetrating into the literary language: *ikki tävä satγyn alup tururmän säkiz*

jarmaqqa 'I have bought two camels to eight kopecks'.

Present and Future tenses system. In all the monuments of the period under study the most used verbal form of the Present-Future tense is the Aorist -*ar/ -ur*. In the texts of KR, NF, Kb, J., KhSh, MN, Gb, CC, IM there are the following meanings: a) specific Present tense; b) usual repeating action; c) action that will happen in the Future. For the -*jur* form in the meaning of the specific Present tense the declension is fulfilled by using personal and number inflection, structural similarity is inherent. Variations are defined in the first person plural form: -*myz* ~ -*byz*. The norm is -*myz* form. However, the first person plural form is recorded rarely if ever. In KR and NF both -*myz* and -*byz* forms occur, nonetheless, -*myz* is the norm. In KhSh, MN, Gb, IM the only occurrence of -*byz* is registered, in J. and Kb there is no first person plural form at all.

-*a* form Present tense is marked by its low occurrence in the monuments. None is in KR, NF; in J., Kb, KhSh only single examples are registered, mostly in the form of the third person singular.

In 'Nahj al-Faradis' -*a* form is not recorded in the Present tense meaning, although -*a turur* analytical form actively penetrated the Present tense paradigm of the monument. This form is used in all the three persons both singular and plural with the high occurrence. The main function of the form is the expression of the Present urgent action connected with the speaking point or the message; conf.: *käfer-lär külüš-ü turur-lar* 'kuffar continue laughing'. Penetration of this form into the verbal system of the monument, which is generally marked by the basic Karakhanid-Uighur peculiarities, maintains the fact of the Kipchak spoken environment pressure, the native of which was the author of the monument – Mahmud al-Bulgari who comes from the Volga region. This is the illustrative example of how the written tradition goes through the pressure by the Kipchak regional Koine.

-γai Future tense is an efficient form in the language of all the monuments; it stands out as the primary form of the Future tense expression. However, in the certain cases it expresses the modal meaning of a wish; conf. *oγlum uluγaj-sa ul saxraqa barγaj buzaγuny talab qylγaj* (NF) 'when the son grows up, let him go to that steppe and require that calf'.

As a rule, in the poetic texts -γa clipped form is recorded with the same meaning. It is remarkable that -γa clipped form expected in the poetical language of the KhSh is registered in prosaic text of the IM, what can be explained by the fact that their copyist was Kipchak Berke Fakikh.

The other parts of the Present and Future tenses paradigm, such as -*γu, -ysar, -γučy, -dačy* (relevant to Karakhanid-Uighur monuments language), are placed in the peripheral position, but certain cases of usage are registered in the language of KR, NF, Gb, J. The tenses and forms correlation is seen in the Table 2.

Table 2. Classification of the aspect and tense forms of the monuments

Forms	KR	NF	Kb	J.	KhSh	MN	Gb	CC	IM
Imperfect -*dy*	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
Perfect -*myš*	○	○	●	○	●		●	●	●
Perfect -*γan*					●	●		●	●
Perfect -*γan turur*		●						●	●
Perfect -*yp tur(ur)*		●				●	○	○	●
Perfect -*yp*					●		○	○	○
Present -*a tur(ur)*	●	○			●				
Present -*a*			●	●	●		●	○	●
Future -*γaj*	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Future -*ysar*			●	●	●		●		
Future -*γusy*	●								

The monuments' verbal system consideration shows that this system, together with the stable basic components contained in the Turkic languages of the earlier stages of development and which mainly refer to the Karakhanid-Uighur linguistic tradition, in the new area – the Volga region it experiences remarkable shifts towards including some new local regional Kipchak forms into the system (conf.: -*a, -a tur(ur), -γan, -yb, -ybtur*). It is noticeable that the language of the certain monuments reflects different stages of this dynamics (conf. NF's and MN's language).

As for the verb impersonal, the biggest interest presents the classification of the participles in their attributive function in different monuments' language. It must be noted that here all the participle forms known in the history of the Turkic languages of the period under study are registered: -*r, -γan, -an, -myş, -γu, -γučy, -duq, -dačy, -asy*. As it is seen, among them there are the forms typical for the Oghuz, Uighur-Oghuz, Karluk and Kipchak linguistic groups. The Oghuz and Uighur forms take the very peripheral place among the impersonal attributive forms: -*an, -asy, -γu, -duq, -γučy, -dačy*. The main clashing of the attributive function is between -*γan* and -*myş*, and in the language of certain monuments the relevance according to the frequency of their usage arouses interest. In general, the dominant is -*γan* form, though -*myş* form was also accepted by the monuments' authors as its full semantic equivalent, which might be used in the literary texts.

Adverbs as the impersonal forms have the following markers: -*p, -a, -ä, -u, -ü, -γaly, -γynča, -uban, -γač*.

As well as with the attributive forms, our statistic data show that Uighur-Oghuz forms which are considered to be the norm in the literary monuments of the Kara-Khanid period, give in to the dominant markers: -*p, -a, -u*. -*γač* form can be

considered as a new one. It is the most frequent in the language of KhSh; conf.: *basqaq haraž ulγač qylur här dam ilži* 'when the conqueror took the render, every time he sent the ambassador'. It is remarkable, that in the texts of KR, NF, KhSh, MN the single form of -*a* adverb acts as the adverbial modifier. For example: *toja taγam jimädim* (NF) 'I didn't eat till sated', *kilä äjtür* (KhSh, 195) 'told, passing by' etc., i.e. in the function common to an earlier period language. This fact is important not only for the history of Tatar literary language but for the history of Tatar language development as a whole, as later this adverb starts to be used in a paired form. However, even the monuments' language register the paired usage of the -*a, -u* forms.

Among the impersonal substantival forms -*maq* form dominate entirely, its synonym is -*maγa* form. The -*maq* form, being familiar to a range of Turkic languages, is mainly in the nature of the Eastern area Turkic languages. Its registration in the literary monuments is obviously connected with the post-Kara-Khanid period, as it gets widespread starting from the language of the Golden Horde and Chagatai monuments. Against this form, in the language of the monuments under study -*yš, -γu* verbal noun forms refer to the peripheral forms and are recorded in single occasions.

Among the nine analysed monuments only in KhSh, MN, Gb, CC a new substantival -*rγa* form is registered. It functions mostly as a supine, i.e. marks the aim of an action; conf.: *seniŋ yšqyŋda sajra-rγa Xaräzmi* (MN) 'to sing your love, Khorezmi'. Disregarding the low frequency, this form is regional, relevant to the Volga region language. Thus, the studied monuments register the early stages of the spreading of this form in the Volga region.

Conclusion

As the results of the conducted research, it is ascertained that in the cultural centres of the Golden Horde since the beginning of the XIV century (assumed date) it starts to form the variant of the Turkic-Tatar literary language which consequently develops into the Old Tatar literary language. The language in its further development passes through a complicated way, nonetheless in its structure Karakhanid-Uighur traditions (primary for all the Turkic literary languages) remained for a long time.

The conducted linguistic analysis has an important social-linguistic meaning. On the one hand, it helped to find the sources of the Old Tatar literary language. On the other hand, the role of the Kipchak

regional Koine, which was spread within the Golden Horde bonders and led to the traditional literary written language changing, was defined. Our materials and, first of all, the statistic data firmly approve that in the cultural centres of the Golden Horde, in the Volga region there was created an ethnographic situation where the Turkic tribes, the natives of the Old Kipchak dialects played the crucial part. Hence, the linguistic data strongly approve the historical research results on the process of the Kipchakisation of the local population since the XIV century.

Corresponding Author:
Dr.Nurieva Fanuza Shakurovna
Kazan Federal University
Kremlevskaya Street, 18, Kazan, 420008, Russia

References
1. Tenishev, E.R., 1988. Principles of compilation of the historical Grammars and history of the literary languages. Soviet Turkic studies, 3: 67-78.
2. Samoylovich, A.N., 1928. To the history of the Central Asian Turkic literary language. Mir-Ali Shir. Leningrad, pp: 3-28.
3. Zajaczkowski, A., 1958. Najatarsza wersja turecka Husräv u Širin Qutba. Warszawa Tect, pp: 304.
4. Najip, E.N., 1989. Research on the Turkic languages history of XI-XIV centuries. Nauka, pp: 291.
5. Thomason, S.G., Kaufman, T., 1991. Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics. University of California Press, pp: 395.
6. Blagova, G.F., 1987. Turkic declension in the areal-historical coverage: Eastern region. Nauka, pp: 304.
7. Nurieva, F.S., 2004.Historical and linguistic conditions of the Golden Horde period Turkic-Tatar literary language formation. Kazan University Publishing, pp: 376.
8. Johanson, L. 2002. Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts. Routhledge, pp: 186.
9. Yusupova, A.S., 2014. Tatar Language Dictionaries of XIX Century as a Unified Historical and Cultural Phenomenon. World Applied Sciences Journal, 30 (2): 186-190.
10. Bombaci, A., 1968. Histoire de literature torque. Trans. I. Melikoff, pp: 321.
11. Ata, A., 1998. Nehcul-Feradis Ustmahlarning Acuk yoli. Dizin sozluk. Ankara Turk Dil Kurumu Yayinlari., pp: 538.
12. Clauson, G., 1972. An etymological Dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish. Oxford Clarendon Press, pp: 74-166.
13. Roger, L., 1984. Phonology: An Introduction to Basic Concepts. Cambridge University Press, pp: 362.
14. Lehmann, W.P., 1992. Historical Linguistics: An Introduction. London Routledge, pp: 338.
15. Schutz, E., 1972. Remarks on Initial D-in Kipchak Languages. Tomus. Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. XXV, pp: 369-381.
16. Erdal, M., 1991. Old Turkic Word Formation: A Functional Approach to the Lexicon. Wiesbaden Harrassowitz Verlag, pp: 874.

6/24/2014